



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,268	12/02/2003	Greg Miller	03-40216-US	3359
26345 7590 09/18/2009 GIBBONS P.C. ONE GATEWAY CENTER NEWARK, NJ 07102				
EXAMINER CHOL PETER H				
ART UNIT 3623		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 09/18/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

IPDocket@gibbonslaw.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/726,268

Applicant(s)

MILLER ET AL.

Examiner

PETER CHOI

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-16 and 21-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-16 and 21-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 26, 2009 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. The following is a **NON-FINAL** office action upon examination of application number 10/726,268. Claims 6-16 and 21-25 are pending in the application and have been examined on the merits discussed below.
3. In the response filed June 26, 2009, claim 6 has been amended, and no claims have been withdrawn, cancelled, or newly presented for examination.
4. The previous rejection of claims 6-16 and 21-25 raised under 35 USC, second paragraph, is hereby withdrawn.
5. The previous obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 6-13, 18 and 20 over claims 1, 3-5, 10-11, 13 and 15-16 of copending application number 10/949,890 is hereby withdrawn because, as noted by Applicant, a Notice of Abandonment was issued for the '890 application on June 23, 2009.

6. The previous rejection of claims 6-16 and 21-25 raised under 35 USC 101 is hereby withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the 35 USC 102(b) rejection of claim 6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

8. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The specification has been amended in the response filed June 26, 2009, to claim priority to U.S. provisional application serial number 60/408,606, filed September 4, 2002. However, 60/408,606 is entitled "METHOD FOR REDUCING RUNOUT USING CLOCK HEAD PLAYBACK DURING SERVO WRITING", filed September 6, 2002, and is not by the same inventive entity as the instant application. Examiner notes that 60/408,066 is entitled "SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR A PLANNER" and was filed September 4, 2002. The Examiner speculates that this is the intended application to which a priority claim is being made. Examiner recommends that the discrepancy be resolved by correcting the presumed typographical error. Appropriate correction is required.

Priority

9. Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged.

Official Notice

10. In the previous Office Action mailed July 22, 2008, notice was taken by the Examiner that certain subject matter is old and well known in the art. Per MPEP 2144.03(c), these statements are taken as admitted prior art because no traversal of this statement was made in the subsequent response. Specifically, it has been taken as prior art that:

- Using DLLs to store commonly used subroutines and HTML templates are old and well known in the art of programming in a windows environment utilizing web technologies
- Calendaring systems display (report) day/week/month appointments/meetings
- Tracking a type, status, estimated amount, and actual amount for each expense is old and well known to those of ordinary skill in the art
- Including a phone number in a contacts database is old and well known to those of ordinary skill in the art

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13. Claims 6-11, 13-16, 21-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beckhardt et al. (US Patent # 6,085,166) in view of Capek et al. (US Patent #7,343,312) and Thomas Haynes, Sandip Sen, Neeraj Arora and Rajani Nadella's "An Automated Meeting Scheduling System that Utilizes User Preferences" (reference 1-U. referred to herein after as Haynes et al.).

Claim 6:

Beckhardt, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

A planning system being embodied in a computer readable medium and including computer executable instructions and data that comprise:

- ***at least one business rule embodied in the computer readable medium*** (see at least Figure 3 and 4 and corresponding text; column 5, line 32 – column 7, line

15, "The system then compares the list of busy times generated from the user's availability information to determine whether the user is available or not, in step 106.... According to an embodiment of the present invention, in step 106, invitee's profile information may be used when determining availability. Specifically, the invitee's time zone and work location may be considered if the event is to take place at a location remote from the invitee's work location.... If an invitee is in a different time zone or place, and plans on physically attending the proposed event, then the user coordinator of the event is prompted to decide whether to make adjustments to ensure the availability of that invitee... A method according to an embodiment of the present invention also allows coordinators or users to change work hours, time zone, and place of work from a default setting to conform with information on a set travel itinerary. Using this method, invitees having travel plans on a given day may nonetheless have their availability taken into account for a proposed event occurring during that day.... Information such as room capacity and built-in resources are taken into account when determining availability and suitability for a proposed event... If there is no such time interval during which all invitees are available, the system proceeds to determine a "best fit" in step 108... the first step is that the coordinator is requested to assign a weight for each invitee in step 112. That step may be performed at the time the coordinator is asked to invite the resources or persons or may be delayed until a determination is made as to whether free time for all invitees may be located. Alternatively, default values may be assigned to types of resources. For

example, the chairman and the conference room may be assigned a high weighting whereas other individuals may be assigned lower weighting.... In the next step, steps 116 and 118, this method chooses an available time interval based on the lowest weighted value. A value of zero would mean that everyone invited count attend the proposed event at the suggested time interval. In this embodiment, in step 116, the system selects the time interval with the lowest weighted unavailability value. In step 118, the system then eliminates the invitee or resource with the lowest weighting assigned thereto. That new grouping is then returned to steps 104 and 106 to determine the busy times for the new set of invitees and to compare to determine whether those invitees are available at the requested time to determine the busy times for those create a new busy time file with the new reduced list of invitees. The process repeats steps 104, 106, and 108 until a time interval is found based on the reduced number of invitees. That time is presented to the coordinator as a proposed alternative time with the "best fit");

- ***at least one priority designation embodied in the computer readable medium*** (see at least Figure 3 and 4 and corresponding text, column 6, lines 15-35, "If there is no such time interval during which all invitees are available, the system proceeds to determine a "best fit" in step 108... the first step is that the coordinator is requested to assign a weight for each invitee in step 112. That step may be performed at the time the coordinator is asked to invite the resources or persons or may be delayed until a determination is made as to

whether free time for all invitees may be located. Alternatively, default values may be assigned to types of resources. For example, the chairman and the conference room may be assigned a high weighting whereas other individuals may be assigned lower weighting");

- ***a meeting editor embodied in the computer readable medium, wherein at least one meeting is generated for at least one client by the meeting editor in accordance with the at least one business rule and the at least one priority designation*** (see at least Figure 1 and corresponding text, and column 3, lines 5-8 "Specifically, when a coordinator of an event desires to schedule the event using the system according to an embodiment of the present invention, the coordinator specifies the date, time, duration and selects one or more invitees.");
and
- ***at least one tracker embodied in the computer readable medium and communicatively connected to the meeting editor*** (see at least Figure 1 and corresponding text), ***wherein the at least one tracker tracks data items indicative of invitees to the at least one meeting*** (see at least column 3, lines 9-11): "Invitees, as detailed below, may comprise users, resources (such as computer equipment, for example), or rooms, for example."), ***respondents to invitation to the at least one meeting, at least one speaker of the at least one meeting, at least one host of the at least one meeting, finances of the at least one meeting, and a venue of the at least one meeting*** (see at least column 3, lines 9-11): "Invitees, as detailed below, may comprise users,

resources (such as computer equipment, for example), or rooms, for example.”),
and wherein the at least one tracker communicates the at least two data items with the meeting editor (see at least Figure 1 and corresponding text),

- **wherein said priority designation weights the at least two of the data items for the at least one meeting** (see at least Figure 3 and 4 and corresponding text; column 6, lines 15-35, “If there is no such time interval during which all invitees are available, the system proceeds to determine a “best fit” in step 108... the first step is that the coordinator is requested to assign a weight for each invitee in step 112. That step may be performed at the time the coordinator is asked to invite the resources or persons or may be delayed until a determination is made as to whether free time for all invitees may be located. Alternatively, default values may be assigned to types of resources. For example, the chairman and the conference room may be assigned a high weighting whereas other individuals may be assigned lower weighting”; column 6, line 66 – column 7, line 15, “In the next step, steps 116 and 118, this method chooses an available time interval based on the lowest weighted value. A value of zero would mean that everyone invited could attend the proposed event at the suggested time interval. In this embodiment, in step 116, the system selects the time interval with the lowest weighted unavailability value. In step 118, the system then eliminates the invitee or resource with the lowest weighting assigned thereto. That new grouping is then returned to steps 104 and 106 to determine the busy times for the new set of invitees and to compare to determine whether those

invitees are available at the requested time to determine the busy times for those create a new busy time file with the new reduced list of invitees. The process repeats steps 104, 106, and 108 until a time interval is found based on the reduced number of invitees. That time is presented to the coordinator as a proposed alternative time with the "best fit").

Although Beckhardt teaches weighting data items of a meeting (e.g., meeting parameters; see above regarding weighting of invitees and resources), Beckhardt does not explicitly weight said parameters differently when the meeting editor generates the at least one meeting in accordance with the at least one business rule.

However, Capek et al. teaches the weighting of a plurality of meeting parameters differently when in accordance with a business rule for a meeting (col. 4, lines 11-34, "The scheduler pools the requests and weights the variables representing the requested meeting dates, times and locations... The weighting of variables may be based on many different criteria including, but not limited to, a person's corporate title, location, past participation in meetings or lack thereof... variables may be weighted according to the size of the meeting room, the availability of.. equipment, the.. properties of the meeting room, or the cost of the meeting.... It is also contemplated by the invention herein that weighting variables is dynamic and may change over time, and may be different for different meetings. Thus, for some meetings, the proximity of the location may be the most important attribute, while for others the availability of a particular piece of

equipment in a meeting room may be important. Additionally, many different weighting factors, like the ones previously discussed, may be stored in an electronic template which may be accessed and exchanged by network users or attendees when requesting or scheduling a meeting”).

Both Beckhardt and Capek et al. are directed towards considering a plurality of meeting parameters for a plurality of meeting invitees in order to provide a “best” meeting; thus, they are analogous references. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beckhardt to include the step of weighting data items for a meeting (meeting parameters) differently in accordance with a business rule, as taught by Capek et al., because doing so enhances the ability of Beckhardt to provide a meeting that best accommodates the preferences and availability of each user.

Beckhardt and Capek et al. do not explicitly teach that at least one business rule associates the at least two of the data items (from the group of: invitees, respondents to invitation, at least one speaker, at least one host, finances, and a venue) together both in combination with and independently of the at least one meeting.

However, Haynes et al. teaches business rules associating at least two of the data items together both in combination with and independently of the at least one meeting (pages 311-312, “User preferences for meeting topics, proposed meeting

length, host of the meeting, invitees to the meeting, etc. are used to assign a priority for the meeting. For example, user A may be obligated to attend meetings hosted by user B, but not if B was only an invitee... The user provides a threshold for the meeting topics, lengths, hours of the day, and days of the week; thresholds capture soft restraints in the sense that they represent the lack of interest of the user for options rated below the threshold for the corresponding dimension... the user can also weight the preference dimensions, e.g., who is hosting the meeting may be more important than whether the meeting is being held in the morning or in the afternoon... every user should be able to specify his/her own particular weightage scheme... each preference dimension is given a number of votes in proportion to its weight versus the other preference dimensions.... The user preferences component stores the preferences of the user for the nature of schedules, priorities for different types of meetings, preferences for attending meetings with other users, etc.") {see at least how the obligation of user A to attend when user B is the host associates both the invitee and host of a meeting in combination within a business rule for a meeting, and how the user's threshold for meeting topics, lengths, hours of the day, and days of the week associate at least two of the data items together in combination and independent of specific meetings}.

Like Beckhardt and Capek et al., Haynes et al. is also directed towards considering a plurality of meeting parameters for a plurality of meeting invitees in order to provide a "best" meeting; thus, they are analogous references to each other.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Beckhardt to include the step of associating at least two data items (meeting parameters) together both in combination with and independently of at least one meeting, as taught by Haynes et al., because doing so enhances the ability of Beckhardt to provide a meeting that best accommodates the preferences and availability of each user.

Claim 7:

Beckhardt discloses all the limitations of claim 6 as shown above. Furthermore, Beckhardt, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- ***wherein at least one of the at least one client is at least one selected from the group consisting of at least one system administrator, at least one meeting planner*** (see at least see column 3, lines 5-8 "Specifically, when a coordinator of an event desires to schedule the event using the system according to an embodiment of the present invention, the coordinator specifies the date, time, duration and selects one or more invitees."), ***at least one meeting attendee, at least one speaker, and at least one service supplier.***

Claim 8:

Beckhardt discloses all the limitations of claim 6 as shown above. Furthermore, Beckhardt, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- ***wherein said meeting editor comprises:***

- ***a meeting set-up module for setting up each meeting*** (see at least see column 3, lines 5-8 "Specifically, when a coordinator of an event desires to schedule the event using the system according to an embodiment of the present invention, the coordinator specifies the date, time, duration and selects one or more invitees."); ***and***
- ***a meeting manager for managing each set-up meeting*** (see at least column 3, lines 12-15: "The information that is provided is then taken by the system to determine whether that all of the selected invitees are available at the desired date, time, and duration.").

Claim 9:

Beckhardt discloses all the limitations of claim 8 as shown above. Furthermore, Beckhardt, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- ***wherein said meeting editor further comprises:***
 - ***a fulfillment request form manager*** (see at least column 5, lines 32-43: "The system then compares the list of busy times generated from the user's availability information to determine whether the user is available or not, in step 106. The process may also consider other potential event times and dates with the busy time file to determine if an alternative time may be proposed. If all invitees can attend, in step 110, the system sends an invitation to the invitees to attend the event, for example, by electronic mail using the address stored for each invitee. The invitees may then

either accept the invitation, at which point the system would update their respective calendar files with the new event, or if the invitation is declined, the system notifies the requester.” and column 7, lines 16-20: “When the user has been presented either with a time interval with no conflicting busy time or a best fit time interval and selects that time interval, the system then generates an invitation to the invitee.”); **and**

- **a reporter** (see at least column 5, lines 32-43: “The system then compares the list of busy times generated from the user’s availability information to determine whether the user is available or not, in step 106. The process may also consider other potential event times and dates with the busy time file to determine if an alternative time may be proposed. If all invitees can attend, in step 110, the system sends an invitation to the invitees to attend the event, for example, by electronic mail using the address stored for each invitee. The invitees may then either accept the invitation, at which point the system would update their respective calendar files with the new event, or if the invitation is declined, the system notifies the requester.” and column 7, lines 16-20: “When the user has been presented either with a time interval with no conflicting busy time or a best fit time interval and selects that time interval, the system then generates an invitation to the invitee.”).

Claim 10:

Beckhardt discloses all the limitations of claim 6 as shown above. Furthermore, Beckhardt, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- ***wherein the at least one meeting manager comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of an attendance listing manager, an invitee listing manager*** (see at least column 4, lines 49-56: "GUI display unit 312 is responsible for presenting views to the user as described above with respect to FIGS. 5-9 and for receiving input from the coordinator regarding the requested event date, time, duration, and invitees."), ***a speaker listing manager, task listing manager, and a security listing manager.***

Claim 11:

Beckhardt discloses all the limitations of claim 6 as shown above. Furthermore, Beckhardt, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- ***wherein the planning system is a distributed network application*** (see at least Figure 1 and corresponding text, column 2, line 66 – column 3, line 2: "The invention relates to an electronic calendar system with group scheduling that may be provided in, for example, a client/server architecture. The client/server connection may be a networked connection or a dial-up link; Column 3, lines 59-66, "Database 200 may be accessed by one or more servers 204 over a network. User systems 206 may be connected to the servers for providing requests of the servers. Each user system 207 may comprise a computer system connected over a network to one or more other users and to one or more servers. User

systems 206 may also be connected over an intranet or over the internet to one or more other systems. According to an embodiment, user system 207 may be distributed at various locations or domains).

Claim 13:

Beckhardt discloses all the limitations of claim 6 as shown above. Furthermore, Beckhardt, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- ***wherein said at least one tracker comprises at least one database for each meeting*** (see at least column 12, lines 31-33: "Within the framework of the C&S architecture, a user's calendar information is stored alongside his or her mail information in a common data store." and column 3, lines 5-58: "... Database 200 may then comprise an up-to-date collection of the availability information from those electronic mail files collected from some or all of the servers 204 on the system ...").

Claim 14:

Beckhardt discloses all the limitations of claim 13 as shown above. Furthermore, Beckhardt, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- ***wherein the at least one database comprises at least one data attribute selected from the group consisting of a meeting code for the meeting, and at least one of a meeting date, a meeting time, a meeting type, a meeting status, a meeting number and a client meeting number*** (see at least column

3, lines 5-58: "... FIG. 1 depicts a system according to an embodiment of the present invention. According to this embodiment, the system of FIG. 1 may comprise one or more databases 200 having stored thereon one or more profiles 202, one or more calendar files 210 and one or more name and addresses files 212 ...").

Claim 15:

Beckhardt discloses all the limitations of claim 14 as shown above. Furthermore, Beckhardt, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- ***wherein the at least one database further comprises data attributes of the at least one speaker and the venue, and wherein at least one of the at least one speaker and the venue are relationally linked to at least one of the meeting code and the meeting date*** (see at least column 3, lines 5-21:

"Specifically, when a coordinator of an event desires to schedule the event using the system according to an embodiment of the present invention, the coordinator specifies the date, time, duration and selects one or more invitees. Invitees, as detailed below, may comprise users, resources (such as computer equipment, for example), or rooms, for example ... Stored with each name and address file is a calendar file and a profile for a plurality of potential invitees.").

Claim 16:

Beckhardt discloses all the limitations of claim 14 as shown above. Furthermore, Beckhardt, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- ***wherein the venue is relationally stored in the at least one database as one of a pending status and a confirmed status*** (see at least column 12, lines 1-7: "Invitees may accept the event invitation, decline the invitation, propose another event time, or delegate a substitute to attend. Accepted events are automatically posted to the user's calendar. This event status information is made available in graphical form to the event coordinator with just the click of a mouse." and column 8, lines 3-7: "Other shading/coloring or other graphical indications may be used in the boxes listing the individual names and/or graphical time bar to indicate "Free Time," "Busy Time," "OK," "Conflict," or "Other" status indicators.").

Claim 21:

Beckhardt discloses all the limitations of claim 6 as shown above. Furthermore, Beckhardt, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- ***further comprising a finance tracker*** (see at least column 11, lines 51-54: "There is also integration with desktop applications. For example, if an upcoming event requires review of a proposed budget, a linked spreadsheet is available for review with the click of a mouse directly from any Organizer entry.").

Claim 22:

Beckhardt discloses all the limitations of claim 21 as shown above. Furthermore, Beckhardt, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- ***wherein said finance tracker tracks expenses relating to at least one of the at least one meeting*** (see at least column 11, lines 51-54: "There is also integration with desktop applications. For example, if an upcoming event requires review of a proposed budget, a linked spreadsheet is available for review with the click of a mouse directly from any Organizer entry.").

Claim 24:

Beckhardt discloses all the limitations of claim 6 as shown above. Furthermore, Beckhardt, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- ***wherein said tracker comprises a contacts database*** (see at least column 3, lines 5-58: "Name and addresses files 212 may comprise a list all of the names and electronic mail addresses for a plurality or all of the users on an electronic calendar system. A name and address file may be created for each invitee. For example, conference rooms, equipment, and other resources may be included as invitees.").

14. Claims 12, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beckhardt et al. in view of Capek et al. (US Patent #7,343,312) and Haynes et al. as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Official Notice, which has since been entered as prior art.

Claim 12:

Beckhardt discloses all the limitations of claim 6 as shown above. Beckhardt does not disclose the following limitations:

- ***wherein said meeting editor comprises at least one dynamic link library and at least one html template.***

Beckhardt discloses a web server and browser and Windows platform (see at least column 4, lines 50-51: "GUI display unit 312 may A comprise a web browser, for example." and column 11, lines 9-12: "Also, Web server and browser technology that allows users to access calendar information across the Internet is incorporated in the present invention." and column 11, lines 24-28: "The invention has full feature/function parity for all major GUI client platforms, including Windows.RTM. 3.1, Windows 95, Windows NT, OS/2, Macintosh.RTM., and UNIX.RTM.. All major server platforms are similarly supported.") but does not explicitly recite dynamic link libraries and html templates.

However, it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely/improperly challenged Official Notice that using DLLs to store commonly used subroutines and HTML templates are old and well known in the art of programming in a Windows environment utilizing web technologies. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a dynamic link library and

HTML templates as they are the predominant, readily available development tools, and provide programming modularity with a plurality of generic graphical interfaces.

Claim 23:

Beckhardt discloses all the limitations of claim 22 as shown above. Beckhardt does not disclose the following limitations:

- ***wherein said finance tracker tracks a type of each expense, a status of each expense, and estimated amount of each expense, and an actual amount of each expense.***

Beckhardt discloses finances tracking (see at least column 11, lines 51-54: "There is also integration with desktop applications. For example, if an upcoming event requires review of a proposed budget, a linked spreadsheet is available for review with the click of a mouse directly from any Organizer entry.") but does not explicitly track a type, status, estimated and actual amount of each expense.

However, it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely/improperly challenged Official Notice that tracking a type, status, estimated amount, and actual amount for each expense is old and well known to those of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a type, status, estimated amount, and actual amount for each expense in the budget spreadsheet disclosed by Beckhardt in order to accurately

capture the finances associated with a planned event, and further to provide financial accounting information in compliance with generally accepted accounting principles.

Claim 25:

Beckhardt discloses all the limitations of claim 24 as shown above. Furthermore, Beckhardt, as shown, discloses the following limitations:

- ***wherein the contacts database comprises a name, address,*** (see at least Figure 1 and corresponding text and column 1, lines 60-64: "It is another object of the invention to provide an electronic calendar with group scheduling that may automatically coordinate scheduling of invitees, where the invitees name/address (or equivalent information) resides on multiple servers.") ***of at least one of an invitee, an attendee, a speaker, a host, a venue, a moderator, and an audio-visual supplier for at least one of the at least one meeting.***

Beckhardt does not disclose the following limitations:

- ***wherein the contacts database comprises a phone number ...***

However, it has been admitted as prior art, as a result of untimely/improperly challenged Official Notice that including a phone number in a contacts database is old and well known to those of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a telephone number in either the "name and address" or "user profiles" files of Beckhardt

as having access to a phone number is an easy and quick method of contacting a meeting invitee or attendee and further provides a more complete user profile with information that provide alternative means that can be used to inform users of pending or tentative meetings or events for consideration.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following references discuss scheduling meetings with constrained parameters:

- Kaufman et al. (US Patent #7,027,995)
- Conmy et al. (US Patent #6,101,480 and 7,082,402)
- Etkin (USPGPub 2002/0120548)
- Thakkar et al. (US Patent #7,359,946)
- Mashiko et al. (US Patent #7,167,833)
- Tolopka (US Patent #6,064,976)
- Sandip Sen, Thomas Haynes and Neeraj Arora's "Satisfying User Preferences While Negotiating Meetings" (reference 1-V).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PETER CHOI whose telephone number is (571)272-6971. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 3623
/Jonathan G. Sterrett/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623